

135946-1

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-112 are pending in the present Application. Claims 108-112 have been allowed; claims 6-19, 24, 29-30, 33, 36-37, 41, 44-49, 52, 65, 70, 77-78, 81, 84-85, 87-89, 93, and 95-96 have been objected to; claims 1-5, 10, 13, 15, 20-23, 25-28, 31-32, 34-35, 38-40, 42-43, 45, 50-51, 53-57, 59-64, 66-69, 71-76, 79-80, 82-83, 86, 90-92, 94-95, 97-103, and 104-107 have been rejected; claims 4-6, 66-67, 70, and 75-76 have been canceled; and claims 1, 7-13, 18, 38-42, 63, 68-69, 71, 77-80, 101-103, and 107 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-3, 7-65, 68-69, 71-74, and 77-112 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. The Specification has been amended to add information directed to the Serial Number of a copending application, as explained in detail below. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Amendments to Claims 7-9, 12, and 38-41

Claims 7-9 have been amended to contain the term "first"; claim 12 was amended to contain the term "second"; and claims 38-41 have been amended to contain the term "third" when describing the filtration system. These numbers do not indicate a particular order, but rather are numerical indicators used to clearly distinguish one system from another.

Allowable and Allowed Subject Matter

Claims 6-19, 24, 29-30, 33, 36-37, 41, 44, 45-49, 52, 65, 70, 77-78, 81, 84-85, 87-89, 93, and 95-96 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 6 and intervening claims 4 and 5, rendering amended claim 1 allowable. As claim 1 has been amended into allowable form, claims 2-3 and 7-62, which ultimately depend from claim 1, should also be allowable.

135946-1

Claim 63 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 70 and intervening claims 66-67, rendering claim 63 allowable. As claim 63 has been amended into allowable form, claims 64-65, 68-69, 71-74, and 82-106, which ultimately depend from claim 63, should also be allowable.

Claim 78 is allowable and has been amended to include the limitations of intervening claims 63 and 75-76. As claim 78 has been amended into independent form, claims 77 and 79-81, which ultimately depend from claim 78, should also be allowable.

Based on the foregoing amendments, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-3, 7-65, 68-69, 71-74, and 77-106.

The Applicants extend their appreciation for the allowance of claims 108-112.

#### Claim Objections

Claim 25 is objected to as failing to further limit the subject matter of the preceding claim. Applicants respectfully disagree that claim 25 fails to further limit claim 22. Claim 22 describes melt filtering a melt mixture through a melt filtration system. Claim 25 further limits the type of melt filtration system: continuous or batch. As claim 25 further limits the subject matter of claim 22, the Applicants respectfully request removal of the objection.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 102 and 103 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The two claims have been amended to claim priority to claim 82, thereby providing antecedent support for the term "solvent".

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 20-23, 25-26, 28, 32, 34-35, 38-40, 42-43, 45, 50-51, 53-56, and 60-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by JP 63-256426 to Moritani et al. ("Moritani").

To anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose each and every element of the claim. *Lewmar Marine v. Varient Inc.*, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

135946-1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 6 and intervening claims 4 and 5, rendering amended claim 1 allowable. Claims 2-3, 20-23, 25-26, 28, 32, 34-35, 38-40, 42-43, 45, 50-51, 53-56, and 60-62 all ultimately depend from claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the rejections to claims 1-3, 20-23, 25-26, 28, 32, 34-35, 38-40, 42-43, 45, 50-51, 53-56, and 60-62.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 27, 31, 63-64, 66-69, 71-76, 79-80, 82-83, 86, 90-92, 94-95, 97-100, 102, and 104-107 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Moritani. Claims 4-5, 10, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Moritani in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,838,102 to Bennett et al. ("Bennett"). Claims 57 and 101 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Moritani in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,130,356 to Feureherd et al. ("Feureherd"). Claims 59 and 103 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Moritani in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,733,299 to Cooper et al. ("Cooper").

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, i.e., that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claims 4-5, 66-67, and 75-76 have been canceled. Claims 63 and 78 have been amended into allowable form as previously described. Dependent claims 64, 68-69, 71-74, 82-83, 86, 90-92, 94-95, and 97-106 all ultimately depend from Claims 63 and 78. Applicants, therefore, request reconsideration and removal of the rejections to these claims.

Claim 107 has been amended to require the packaging, storing, or packaging and storing of the polymeric material to be performed in an environment substantially free of particulate impurities. Neither Moritani, nor Bennett teaches or suggests all elements of amended claim 107.

Moritani generally discloses a method of producing optical elements prepared by fused

135946-1

molding of a resin composition obtained by first dissolving a resin composition consisting of a polymeric portion mainly containing aromatic vinyl monomer and polyphenylene ether portion, followed by removing the foreign particles by filtration of the solution obtained by dissolving the composition in an organic solvent and then removing the organic solvent by passing it through an extrusion type pelletization machine having a vent in it.

Bennett generally discloses the removal of metallic catalyst residues from reaction solutions containing polyphenylene ethers produced by an oxidative coupling of a phenol in the presence of an oxygen-containing gas and a metal-amine complex catalyst. Removal of the metal component is effected by contacting the solution with a compound capable of selectively complexing with the metal to form a water soluble compound and by subsequent liquid-liquid extraction with an aqueous medium.

Neither Moritani, nor Bennett teaches or suggests the claim element "wherein the packaging, storing, or packaging and storing of the polymeric material is performed in an environment substantially free of particulate impurities." As the references, alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest all the elements of amended claim 107, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the rejection.

#### Amendment to the Specification

Paragraph [0169] on page 56 of the Specification has been amended to include the Application Serial No. 10/648,609 of a copending application corresponding to Attorney docket No. 120801. It is pointed out that the title of the copending application was incorrect in the Specification of the present application. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

135946-1

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 07-0862.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 

Roberta L. Pelletier

Registration No. 46,372

Date: January 13, 2005  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No.: 23413